

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

NATALIA ALEKSEYEVNA
YASHCHENKO et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ALEJANDRO MAYORKAS, Secretary of the
Department of Homeland Security, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:23-cv-01387-LK

ORDER DENYING MOTION
FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED
UNDER PSEUDONYMS
WITHOUT PREJUDICE

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiffs' Administrative Motion for Leave to Proceed Under the Pseudonyms Jane Doe, John Doe, and Jack Doe. Dkt. No. 17.¹ Defendants do not oppose the motion. Dkt. No. 17 at 2. However, Plaintiffs have not adequately supported their motion. Specifically, the declaration that Plaintiffs submitted in support of their motion, Dkt. No.

¹ Plaintiffs filed a "corrected" motion after filing an essentially identical original motion. *See id.* at 1; Dkt. No. 16. This is not the first time Plaintiffs have filed a "corrected" document. *See* Dkt. No. 6 at 1; Dkt. No. 7 at 1; Dkt. No. 14 at 1. In addition, the Court notes that Plaintiffs' motion violates Local Civil Rule 7(e)(6), which requires a word count certification. The Court cautions Plaintiffs that future unexplained and potentially unnecessary multiplication of proceedings in this case, or submissions that fail to comply with the applicable rules, may result in sanctions. *See* LCR 11(c).

1 17-1, is not compliant with 28 U.S.C. § 1746. That statute requires that the declaration be made
2 “substantially” in the following language: “I declare (or certify, verify, or state) under penalty of
3 perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on (date).” 28 U.S.C. § 1746(2); *see also*
4 *Commodity Futures Trading Comm’n v. Topworth Int’l, Ltd.*, 205 F.3d 1107, 1112 (9th Cir. 1999).
5 The purpose of this affirmation is to be certain that “the declarant understands the legal
6 significance of the declarant’s statements and the potential for punishment if the declarant lies.”
7 *United States v. Bueno-Vargas*, 383 F.3d 1104, 1111 (9th Cir. 2004). Plaintiffs’ declaration does
8 not include a certification under penalty of perjury, nor does it contain a statement that the contents
9 of the declaration are true.

10 For the foregoing reasons, the Court DENIES Plaintiffs’ motion without prejudice. Dkt.
11 No. 17.

12 Dated this 17th day of November, 2023.

13 

14 Lauren King
15 United States District Judge
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24